DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 490 AA 000 794

AUTHOR	Erickson, Donald A.; Madaus, George F.
TITLE	Issues of Aid to Nonpublic Schools. Summary Analysis.
INSTITUTION	Boston Coll., Chestnut Hill, Mass. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	President's Commission on School Finance, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	17 Sep 71
NOTE	37p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Catholic Schools; *Educational Finance; Educational Problems; *Private Schools; *Public Policy; *School Support

ABSTRACT

This is a summary analysis of Volumes I, II, III, and IV (see ED 058 486--489 of Issues of Aid to Nonpublic Schools. The cardinal ideas in these volumes are discussed under the following topics: Popular Fallacies as to the Role of Nonpublic Schools; The Nature of the Crisis in Nonpublic Schools; and Perils of Public Policy. The central outcomes of the study are stated as follows: I. A number of popular conceptions as to the role of nonpublic schools in American life are questionable and misleading; II. The nature of the crisis in nonpublic education is quite different from what is generally assumed; and III. Superficial attempts to alleviate the crisis will probably produce results opposite to those officially espoused. (For related document, see ED 058 473.) (DB)

Issues of Aid to Nonpublic Schools

Summary Analysis

Prepared by
Center for Field Research and School Services
Boston College

Submitted to The President's Commission on School Finance

THIS IS ONE OF SEVERAL REPORTS PREPARED FOR THIS COMMISSION. TO AID IN OUR DELIBERATIONS, WE HAVE SOUGHT THE BEST QUALIFIED PEOPLE AND INSTITUTIONS TO CONDUCT THE MANY STUDY PROJECTS RELATING TO OUR BROAD MANDATE. COMMISSION STAFF MEMBERS HAVE ALSO PREPARED CERTAIN REPORTS.

WE ARE PUBLISHING THEM ALL SO THAT OTHERS MAY HAVE ACCESS TO THE SAME COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF THESE SUBJECTS THAT THE COMMISSION SOUGHT TO OBTAIN. IN OUR OWN FINAL REPORT WE WILL NOT BE ABLE TO ADDRESS IN DETAIL EVERY ASPECT OF EACH AREA STUDIED. BUT THOSE WHO SEEK ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS INTO THE COMPLEX PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION IN GENERAL AND SCHOOL FINANCE IN PARTICULAR WILL FIND MUCH CONTAINED IN THESE PROJECT REPORTS.

WE HAVE FOUND MUCH OF VALUE IN THEM FOR OUR OWN DELIBERATIONS. THE FACT THAT WE ARE NOW PUBLISHING THEM, HOWEVER, SHOULD IN NO SENSE BE VIEWED AS ENDORSEMENT OF ANY OR ALL OF THEIR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS. THE COMMISSION HAS REVIEWED THIS REPORT AND THE OTHERS BUT HAS DRAWN ITS OWN CONCLUSIONS AND WILL OFFER ITS OWN RECOMMENDATIONS. THE FINAL REPORT OF THE COMMISSION MAY WELL BE AT VARIANCE WITH OR IN OPPOSITION TO VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THIS AND OTHER PROJECT REPORTS.

The President's Commission on
School Finance

Neil H. McElroy, Chairman
Mary T. Brooks
William G. Colman
Hilda A. Davis
John B. Davis, Jr.
John H. Fischer
Dorothy M. Ford
Norman Francis
Eugene Gonzales
Warren P. Knowles
David H. Kurtzman
Duane Mattheis
William E. McManus
Wendell H. Pierce
William G, Saltonstall
W. B. Thompson
Clarence Walton
Ivan E. Zylstra

Norman Karsh, Executive Director

ISSUES OF AID TO NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Summary Analysis

Center for Field Research and School Services
Boston College

Donald A. Erickson
The University of Chicago

George F. Madaus
Boston College

September 17, 1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....Page 1

POPULAR FALLACIES AS TO THE ROLE OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS 2

THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS.....13

PERILS OF PUBLIC POLICY.....22

SOME FINAL THOUGHTS ON THE ISSUE OF EDUCATIONAL PLURALISM IN THE UNITED STATES: HIGHLIGHTS OF A FINAL REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FINANCE *

Donald A. Erickson
Midwest Administration Center
University of Chicago

George F. Madaus
Center for Field Research
and School Services
Boston College

This paper is presented in response to the Commission's request for a summary analysis of our earlier 2,500 page report.[1] What follows is neither a chapter-by-chapter precis nor a recapitulation of findings and conclusions. Rather, it restates (and at some points expands) the cardinal ideas in our earlier work. As a focused rather than comprehensive commentary, it reflects what we think most salient to federal policy, and to that extent, is subjective. Other scholars, examining the same research report, might emphasize different facets.

The central outcomes of our work may be subsumed under three statements.

I. A number of popular conceptions as to the role of nonpublic schools in American life are questionable and misleading.

II. The nature of the crisis in nonpublic education is quite different from what is generally assumed.

*Submitted to the President's Commission on School Finance, September 17, 1971.

III. Superficial attempts to alleviate the crisis will probably produce results opposite to those officially espoused.

The rest of the paper deals with each of these ideas in turn. Because of space limitations, the treatment is often cursory. Readers will need to examine the final report itself for an adequate justification of numerous conclusions discussed here.

1. POPULAR FALLACIES AS TO THE ROLE OF NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

A. Considerations of Racial Justice. --Even such prominent scholars as Thomas Pettigrew have made unwarranted statements concerning the role of nonpublic schools in the area of racial justice. Pettigrew asserts, for example, that "a primary cause of segregation in the schools is the existence of private schools--parochial schools in particular."[2] However this declaration has been challenged by David Seeley, who for many months was in charge of enforcing civil rights in the U. S. Office of Education.[3] When we investigated a racially changing community in Chicago in which most citizens seemed committed to achieving stable racial integration, the evidence suggested that nonpublic schools had been essential to that effort.[4] Without the nonpublic schools, the majority of middle-class residents would probably have fled to the suburbs long ago. Most parents who were interviewed described public schools in the area as academically substandard, morally threatening, and physically unsafe. When we examined several communities in Chicago and Boston where most white

citizens appeared antagonistic to racial integration, we found little to indicate that integration would have been achieved if nonpublic schools had not been available.[5] In fact, white residents would more likely have abandoned these neighborhoods. In one case, the availability of nonpublic schools to frightened white parents seemed to help stabilize conditions, allowing black and white citizens from adjoining communities to begin meeting to discuss their common problems. Given sufficient time, perhaps, that neighborhood may be able to defuse its racial hostilities further and move toward voluntary, controlled integration. Without nonpublic schools as "safe" places for their children in the short run, virtually all the whites might desert the scene, making integration impossible in the longer run.

We cannot readily generalize from this evidence, for the sample communities were few in number and fortuitously selected, but it is evident that the effects of nonpublic schools in the quest for racial justice are more complex than has generally been asserted. There is no valid basis, so far as we can determine, for announcing that we would have more racial integration (at least in Northern cities, where the bulk of our research took place) if nonpublic schools did not exist. The opposite could very well be the case.

B. Public School Support.--One often encounters the charge that nonpublic schools deprive public schools of moral and financial support.[6] Most patrons of nonpublic schools are, it appears, less enthusiastic than public school patrons about raising the level of

public educational expenditures, though no less enthusiastic than other citizens without children in public schools.[7] But what is generally overlooked is the effect of relieving public schools of the expense of educating the many students who are in nonpublic schools.

According to the sketchy evidence available, this financial relief outweighs the relative reluctance of patrons of nonpublic schools to augment public school taxation. In areas where greater proportions of the school-age population are enrolled in nonpublic schools, per-capita support of public education is lower, but per pupil support of public education is higher. Several other disconfirmations of prevailing folklore concerning public school support are discussed in our final report.

C. Equality of Educational Opportunity.--Nonpublic schools frequently have been depicted as institutions of privilege for the middle and upper classes, while public schools are described as the major avenue of upward mobility for the oppressed and poor.[8] Recent research indicates that public education seldom has offered the equality of opportunity that is often taken for granted.[9] The widespread tendency for public school financing arrangements to guarantee the rich a well supported education at low tax rates while ensuring the poor a meagerly supported education at high tax rates (a pattern recently labeled unconstitutional by the California Supreme Court) is now well documented.[10]

Our own work raises provocative new possibilities concerning the functions of nonpublic schools in this regard.

In a comparative study in Michigan in 1966-67, of public schools and the three largest groups of nonpublic schools (Catholic, Missouri Synod Lutheran, and Calvinist) three surprising findings emerged[11]

(1) The Catholic elementary schools were far more accessible to urban low income families than the relevant literature had suggested (see Tables 1 - 5, reproduced here because they are not in our final report).

(2) There was more evidence of equality of opportunity in the church-related schools than in the public schools. Of fifteen "advantages" considered, only three were as frequently available in low status public schools as in high status public schools, whereas the corresponding figures were eight in Lutheran schools, seven in Catholic schools, and six in Calvinist schools.[13]

(3) So far as the bulk of these educational "advantages" were concerned, the child in the low-status community was better off in church-related schools than in nonpublic schools, whereas the child in the high-status community was better of in public schools than in church-related schools. Within the socio-economic range of children attending them, church-related schools demonstrated less of a tendency than public schools to discriminate against the poor.

These findings were not widely publicized at the time, for the extent to which the educational "advantages" were reflected in achievement was not known, the data relating to socio-economic status

had been derived from estimates by school principals, and the possibility was obvious that the relationships, never uncovered in previous research, were unique to Michigan or even an artifact of undetected weaknesses in the research design.

More recently, however, similar tendencies have reappeared in a major city in another Midwestern state (Chicago) in a study with more adequate data.[14] The sample consisted of 74 randomly selected Catholic elementary schools, one each in the 74 Chicago communities (defined by Community Fact Book) with elementary schools, along with one or (whenever possible) two public school(s) located nearby in each neighborhood. The following findings (among others) were indicated.

(1) Though more Catholic schools were found in wealthier areas than in poor areas, when location was controlled (by means of the stratified sampling described earlier) it was evident that the Catholic schools were not, as had often been charged, filtering off the more intelligent students in each area and leaving the dregs in the public schools. City-wide, the 50th percentile IQ in the sample was 106.0 for public schools and 104.5 for Catholic schools. This finding was not attributable to any tendency for Catholic schools to filter off the brightest students in poor neighborhoods, and the dullest students in wealthy neighborhoods, at least so far as ability factors reflected in the IQ were concerned. In fact, the Catholic school IQ's fell further behind the public school IQ's in poor neighborhoods than in wealthy neighborhoods.

(2) Dollar outlays per pupil for instruction by the Catholic chools were more evenly distributed across neighborhoods of arying wealth than was the case with the public schools. In low- ncome communities, (median incomes under $8,500 per year), Catholic chool students gained more in reading and mathematics achievement etween the third and sixth grades than did public school students in terms of grade-equivalent norms, 2.9 as compared with 2.0) hereas in the higher-income communities (median incomes over 10,800), Catholic school students gained less than public school tudents (3.5 as compared with 3.8).

(3) The achievement gap between children from high-status ommunities and children from low-status communities was widened etween grades 3 and 6 considerably more in public schools (where he gain of high-status children was 3.8 and the gain of low-status hildren was 2.00, or about half as much) than in the Catholic chools (where the former children gained 3.5 and the latter gained .9, a rather similar amount).

(4) Though the Catholic schools were trying in a special way, t seemed, to cater to disadvantaged children--by providing a higher roportion of auxiliary personnel and a lower pupil-teacher ratio n low-income areas than elsewhere--in-school factors of this type ere reflected in achievement to a lesser extent than in public chools, while out-of-school factors were reflected in achievement o a greater extent than in public schools. Perhaps in academic articulars, just as in the religious particulars examined in the reeley-Rossi study, the effectiveness of the Catholic school

depends upon a mutual-reinforcement dynamic.[15] Thus, Catholic schools may capitalize on home values and activities much more than public schools are prone to do. The possibility that differential dynamics, including self selection by high or low achievement oriented families into the parochial and public schools, is further emphasized by the finding that academic achievement gains are associated with larger school size in the public group and smaller school size in the Catholic group. One plausible theory, in addition to self selection of parochial schools by upwardly mobile families, is that achievement is linked to individualistic competition in public schools, but with a "we-against-the-outside-world" sense of solidarity in the parochial schools. Large school size might reinforce competition, but is likely to dampen a sense of community. Similarly, compatibility between school and home is probably more essential to social solidarity than to a competitive outlook. On the other hand, Petigrew may be on the right track but for the wrong reason. That is the danger to public education from the nonpublic sector lies not drawing off the white students so much as in drawing off achievement oriented black families. However, if such families do not perceive the public school as presently constituted as meeting their needs then the option to select a viable alternative should be their right. This whole area is in need of further in-depth research.

(5) When the amount of achievement attributable to in-school variables in the study was isolated, it was clear that the public schools were benefitting wealthy and white communities more than

oor and black communities, while the Catholic schools were bene-
itting poor and black communities more than wealthy and white com-
unities. While public schools discriminated against the poor and
he black, the parochial schools discriminated against the rich and
he white!

These data suggest, as did the Michigan findings, that while
nrolling a higher proportion of poor students than do the Catholic
chools (and possibly other church-related schools), urban public
chools were contributing to the perpetuation of existing socio-
conomic stratification, whereas Catholic schools were counteracting
t. It is easy to understand the finding some years ago that the
arochial schools functioned as important mechanisms of upward
obility when Catholics were oppressed and poor.[16]

(Data concerning parental perceptions in several recent studies
are much in keeping with these tendencies. Acoording to their own
eports and estimates by principals in the schools their children
ttend, the wealthier Catholics who live in the suburbs are much
less likely than the more impoverished Catholics who live in the
cities, especially the inner cities, to view Catholic schools as
superior to public schools academically, morally, and in other
particulars.)[17]

(6) These compensatory effects in Catholic schools were
being produced at a per-pupil cost only 59.8 per cent as high as
the public school expenditure level. Even when the value of contri-
buted services in Catholic schools was included, these schools were
operating at an estimated cost-equivalent of $260.7 per pupil per

pupil per year as compared with $436.2 per pupil per year in the public schools. Undoubtedly this large difference is due in part to the higher administrative costs, the support tail as it were, associated with public school districts throughout the country.

D. Economies of Scale--A frequent argument often leveled against nonpublic schools is that they fragment the nation's educational enterprise into small, competing units with duplicate programs and facilities, thus making important economies of scale impossible to achieve.[18] The argument is reminiscent of the campaign after World War II to reorganize thousands of small school districts into larger, more efficient units and to consolidate small school-attendance areas into more sizeable tracts.[19] The proponents of reorganization and consolidation cited evidence that more services per dollar were available in larger schools and school districts than in smaller ones.[20] Their data did not relate to the effectiveness of these services, nor was the possibility seriously discussed that rich ethnic subcultures would be destroyed in the process. More recent studies suggest that what were assumed during that era to be economies of scale were in reality often dis-economies.[21] When schools expand, they seldom increase the number of extracurricular activities accordingly. Proportionately fewer students participate in those activities or have opportunity to function in positions of leadership. Youngsters have less contact with either their friends or adults in the school. Guidance personnel, apparently because they do not know the children as well as when the school was smaller, are less effective. Students show less

endency to identify with the purposes of the faculty. Cheating s more frequent. Even if more services are possible, such as a roader range of course offerings and a greater number of specialsts, less student learning may result. The major explanation, it ppears, is that the institution has become too cumbersome and mpersonal to meet the psychic demands of its members. Partiularly during the formative years, human beings may need to idenify with communities small in scale but stable in structure.[22] ronically, several recent research findings point back in the irection of the one-room schoolhouse that was so roundly conemned not long ago.[23]

When school systems are too massive, furthermore, board mers and central office administrators find themselves presiding ver such a polyglot of competing neighborhoods and interest groups hat to be responsive to the organization's clients is impossible.[24] n fact one might argue that "public" schools are "public" only in heir financial base. Virtually any action taken is sure to infuriate several groups. When the system fails to respond (because enerally it cannot), many parents and students are alienated. he alienation, in turn, appears closely linked to low academic chievement.[25] Schools and school systems that cater to constituencies smaller in size and more homogeneous in outlook can adapt more readily to special needs and interests. Small units, closely linked o their communities, may be particularly vital to the survival of umerous ethnic groups, though the recent response of courts and ublic school administrators to the aversion of a Chinese community

in San Francisco to plans for bussing children to distant, ethnically heterogeneous schools reflects little sensitivity in this connection. Even less consideration has been given in several states to the desire of the Old Order Amish to maintain the small rural schools that seem essential to their culture.[26]

(E) National Unity--The fear that educational pluralism will weaken the mucilage that holds the nation together seems difficult to lay to rest.[27] The research of Greely and Rossi indicated that the opposite might be the case, at least as far as the Catholic schools were concerned, for the graduates of these schools seemed somewhat less prejudiced and exclusivistic in their views than were graduates of public schools who came from similar home backgrounds.[28] The fear persists, nevertheless, especially so far as new varieties of nonpublic schooling are concerned. The likelihood is overlooked that the "common school" long ago ceased to be an essential mechanism for ensuring that citizens would exhibit a modicum of common outlooks and values. In the light of the extensive exposure of the young to identical television programs, nationally marketed books and magazines, and fads that strike schools in Florida and Alaska almost simultaneously, perhaps a more important function for schools today is to promote divergent thinking. Furthermore, despite the recent Supreme Court argument, analyses by Vervoort and Steeman both suggest, that attempts to "establish" an official ideological stance in a pluralistic society (whether the attempt be made through established churches or monolothic schooling arrangements) are likely to

roduce, not unity, but disunity. [29] The "pillarization" of society in he Netherlands, often viewed with alarm by American observers, was a ecessity, Vervoort suggests, in a nation torn by religious antagonisms. he pillarization was a way of assuring fundamental rights and privileges hat had previously been denied to minorities, thus defusing long term ostilities. Pillarization permitted gradual progress toward more de- irable socio-political arrangements. In a setting of enforced "commonality," ntagonisms might have intensified. Perhaps our alarm should be directed oward attempts in the United States to stifle new educational options, s witnessed by vociferous opposition of most educator organizations to oucher experiments (even experiments limited and superscribed with great are) and by steps in numerous legislatures to withhold benefits from chools until they have been established for at least 2 or 3 years.

II. THE NATURE OF THE CRISIS IN NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Volume II of our report to the Commission, entitled The Social nd Religious Sources of the Crisis in Catholic Schools, may be our ost crucial single analysis, for misunderstanding is endemic con- erning the reasons for the current enrollment decline in nonpublic chools.

With scattered exceptions, the immediate emergency is almost xclusively a Catholic school phenomenon, particularly focused at he moment on the parochial elementary schools. Nationally, the ewish, Greek Orthodox, Calvinist, Seventh Day Adventist, and rotestant Episcopal schools have been holding their own, as have he generally nonsectarian institutions affiliated with the National ssociation of Independent Schools (NAIS). The NAIS college- reparatory boarding schools, especially those of the military cademy" type, are dramatic, though numerically insignificant, xceptions The Missouri Synod Lutheran schools have experienced nrollment losses, but only to an extent that leaders in the synod ttribute to the recent birth rate decline.

There must be a reason why only Catholic schools have experi- nced startling setbacks in virtually all parts of the country. If, s most relevant legislation obviously assumes, the crisis is asically financial in origin, the Catholic elementary schools should e losing students less rapidly than most other groups, for tuition ees are generally lower in Catholic elementary schools than in al- most any other major collectivity of nonpublic schools.

(Significantly, so far as we are aware, not one of the recent analyses of relationships between enrollment and tuition levels has produced evidence that parents are leaving nonpublic schools primarily because of increasing costs.[30]

The fact that Catholic schools are profoundly threatened while several other church-related groups continue to grow does make sense, however, if one recognizes that changes in the social and religious orientation of school-sponsoring groups have been the most prominent force behind widespread closures of church-related schools in the past.[31] Historically in the United States, the major constellations of church-related schools have existed to assist their clients with problemmatic societal relationships, religious persecution, social exclusion, and ethnic adaptation and survival. When these problems disappeared, the schools were largely abandoned.

The demise during the first half of the Nineteenth Century of many schools once operated by Protestant churches is easily explainable in this light, as Stoeman demonstrates.[32] So long as these churches saw the differences that separated them as all-important, there was obvious need for schools designed to protect children from fatal heresies. But the late Eighteenth and early Nineteenth Centuries in the United States saw

> the growth of a broad religious consensus which made the differences between the [Protestant] churches less significant. ... The public schools, ... incorporated ... this broad religious consensus in their curriculum. They could present themselves, or at least were acceptable to the churches, as being basically

> Protestant Christian in a broad sense. Thus there was little reason left for the denominations to claim their right to educate their children the public school somehow did what was most important in the eyes of the Protestant churches.[33]

The religious groups that continued to maintain their own schools after this crisis of the early Nineteenth Century did not assent to the Protestant consensus whose central values were expressed in the emerging public school system, or while not dissenting from the consensus on theological grounds, were strongly ethnic in orientation. The latter groups, whose exclusivity was mostly ethnic, were the next to go. They failed to survive the abandonment of foreign languages as the medium of instruction that followed hard on the heels of the anti-foreign hysteria of World War I and its aftermaths.[34] Hundreds of Lutheran schools collapsed soon after English was adopted as the language of the classroom.

The religious groups that continued to maintain their own schools after the crisis of the early Twentieth Century were, for the most part, still denied full participation in American society (Roman Catholics) and/or still were very conservative and anti-ecumenical theologically Catholics, the two most conservative Lutheran bodies, the Seventh Day Adventists, and the conservative segment of Protestantism's Calvinist wing, the Christian Reformed).

With this history as background, one would expect the current crisis in nonpublic schools, the crisis of the Mid-Twentieth Century,

to involve primarily the school-sponsoring religious group that is experiencing the most profound shift in social and religious orientation: the Roman Catholic Church. Since other school-sponsoring religious groups such as the Christian Reformed, the Seventh Day Adventists, and Lutheran churches associated with the Missouri and Wisconsin synods--have not yet been caught up wholeheartedly in the winds of ecumenicity and doctrinal change, and have not, like the Catholic Church, very recently been relieved of outcast status, their schools should not be affected comparably, and indeed they are not. But the emergency now facing Catholic education should not be long arriving at other doorsteps. The Lutheran Church--Missouri Synod--at whose annual convention this year the proponents of change and ecumenicity won important victories, will probably be affected first, followed not long afterward, we suspect, by the Calvinist schools (supported largely by the Christian Reformed). There are few signs apparent to the outsider, as yet, of theological liberalism among the Seventh Day Adventists and Wisconsin Synod Lutherans, but if religious sociologists are at all correct, the power of "denominationalizing" forces in our society will eventually affect these groups as well--and simultaneously jeopardize their schools.

But to return to the Catholic schools: The first large wave of Catholic immigrants during the early 1800's found a developing public school system that was admittedly Protestant and blatantly

anti-Catholic. Newly arrived Catholics were persecuted on at least three counts: because they were Catholic, because their cultures were repugnant to WASP traditions, and because they were poor. Public schools were regarded by leading public figures as mechanisms for the obliteration of foreign folkways, especially religious positions outside mainstream Protestantism. The Catholic schools were widely ill-esteemed for numerous reasons, especially because they insulated many Catholic children from "Americanizing" mechanisms. It was partly (largely, some scholars insist) for this reason that early steps were taken to cut off the possibility of public aid to Catholic schools.

During that period in history, the Catholic school existed to preserve the faith of the young in the face of a hostile environment - and a Protestant public school system. Corollary, but often unstated goals, were to help Catholics to achieve middle-class status and to protect the ethnicity of Catholic immigrants from several areas of Europe. As Steeman observes:

> The Catholic parochial school system, then, is an institutional expression of the basic uneasiness which the American Catholic felt in facing American realities. Constantly aware of the fact that his environment was basically Protestant, the Catholic took a position of self-assertion and defensiveness...The simple fact seems to be that the Catholics did not quite fit into the majority pattern of American society.[35]

> We have characterized the Catholic attitude as one of reserved participation in the nation's life, accompanied by a feeling of uneasiness vis-a vis American society. Generally we must say that the Catholic population opted for

> a ghetto-like existence. ... The solution of the 1840's was that the Catholic identity came first, and that a good Catholic would also make a good American. Thus we have an American Catholic rather than a Catholic American.[36]
>
> The parochial schools functioned in the Catholic community very much like the public school in the nation: they had become the object of an emotional investment, an institution symbolic of the Catholic identity in America. The opposition to the public school likewise served to reinforce this separate Catholic identity.[37]

We need not retrace the convoluted processes by which the American Catholic became the Catholic American, and by which the national consensus once embracing only mainstream Protestantism was redefined to include Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, all three now regarding distinctives that previously divided them as subordinate to ideals that unite them--the values of "The American Way of Life." The transition from American Catholic to Catholic American was not without trauma and complication, as Steeman emphasizes. At one point a Pope explicitly condemned the heresy of "Americanism." Not until the Second Vatican Council were many basic changes in American Catholicism, therefore occurring sub rosa for the most part, openly acknowledged and approved.

The anti-Catholic siege has been lifted, and the traditional raison d'etre of Catholic schools, defused. The religious instruction of children still deeply concerns Catholic parents, as abundant research evidence makes clear. But the Americanization process has deflated the necessity of the Catholic school system as the primary agency for religious education, particularly in the minds of the younger, better-educated members of the Church.

In the light of these realities, one must be naive, uninformed, or dishonest to depict the current enrollment decline in nonpublic schools as fundamentally a consequence of cost increases. The evidence belies that contention. This is not to say that finances are not a factor and that public assistance can have no effect, a possibility to which we shall return at a later point. American history seems to reveal no major group of church-related schools which, when faced with a comparably profound shift in client orientations, has managed to adapt and reestablish its viability. But can an institution as deeply established in church structures and loyalties as the Catholic school system, if given half a chance, reorient itself and move into the future revitalized? After examining the events of the past few years, we conclude that the system has had no reasonable opportunity to restructure. As if the whirlwind of internal change symbolized by the Second Vatican Council were not sufficiently difficult to accommodate, Catholic schools have faced in rapid succession, and often simultaneously, such complications among others, as the following

1. A major out-migration of Catholics from the Central cities, where public schools offered little effective competition and Catholic school buildings were widely available, to the suburbs, where public schools were in generally high repute and new facilities had to be erected at a time when construction costs were spiralling at an unprecedented rate.

2. A major in-migration to the central cities of disadvantaged people, mostly non Catholic, who could readily be attracted to Catholic schools for reasons relating to academic quality, moral stability, and physical safety, but often could not afford even the normal fees these schools must levy to survive. The Church had developed no adequate mechanism for raising money where it was plentiful and using it where it was needed the most.

3. A rapid decline in the number of teachers available from the religious orders, teachers whose contributed services represented massive subsidies and whose presence was needed to hold conservative Catholic clients, especially now that the loyalties of more liberal Catholic clients were wavering in the wake of Vatican II.

4. Along with the intensified problem of competing with public schools academically, which triggered the staggering expenses of reduced pupil-teacher ratios, a steep increase in salary costs occasioned by the teacher bargaining movement especially when, as a concomitant of increasing proportions of lay teachers in Catholic schools, the movement spread to the Catholic sector itself.

5. The effects of the recent birth rate decline which, by accentuating enrollment losses, made defections from Catholic schools seem more serious than they actually were and damaged morale accordingly.

6. A surrounding atmosphere of discontent, conflict, confusion, and drastic change.

7. As a consequence of these and other factors, a mounting crisis of confidence that caused parents, teachers, administrators, and supporters whose loyalties might have remained firm in more tranquil times to lose faith in the system's future and cease trying to salvage it.

III PERILS OF PUBLIC POLICY

Unless the foregoing analysis reflects a collosal misinterpretation on our part of data from our studies and many others, a number of implications for public policy are now rather clear. There has always been a demand in our society for alternatives to publicly sponsored education, but the needs and preferences of citizens differ from one era to another. The private educational enterprises that flourished in the colonial era would have made little sense in the early Nineteenth Century, when millions of immigrants sought special instrumentalities to deal with their new environment. In turn, many schools of that period would be hard put finding clients today. And the functions of hundreds of contemporary schools may soon be obsolete. The duty of a government committed to pluralism is to create conditions conducive to the emergence and development of the educational options that each generation craves. If the demand for some forms of nonpublic education is waning, interest in alternatives to conventional instruction is not. Many black citizens, despairing of reform in the public schools desire schools of their own. The "free school" movement has spread in a few months from coast to coast. In many circles, an evident return to ethnicity "may soon eventuate in the desire for varities of instruction that are difficult or impossible to provide in the public sector. Industry is being invited increasingly to try approaches that seem beyond the repertoire of credentialed educators and existing schools. Growing attention is being paid to various

"de-schooling" approaches. As the doctrine recently enunciated by the California Supreme Court begins to have impact nationally, it may soon become impossible for wealthy neighborhoods to ensure that their public schools are more liberally funded than public schools elsewhere, in which case many parents may shift to private schools.

There is no dearth of interest in alternatives. The danger, however, is that they may prove financially feasible, given the current spiral of educational costs, only among affluent families, whereas people of modest means will enjoy few educational options at all. We have said we do not believe the basic factor behind Catholic school defections is financial, but finances are very likely to inhibit new options--especially options that churches are not prepared to subsidize.

The fact that new educational alternatives have not been emerging at a more rapid rate in response to widely articulated public discontent is at least partially the responsibility of government. Tax support of public education (whose resistance to change has become a major area of inquiry for scholars) has forced the costs of educational personnel and facilities to a level that many would-be school founders find prohibitive. As in other areas of life, government intervention has become so massive and ubiquitous as to destroy the previous equilibrium in the scales of individual choice. By virtue of public largesse, public agencies have preempted the field. Carelessly designed support for major existing groups of nonpublic schools, if sufficiently sizeable, could have the effect of merely creating another preemptor, and this in the name of

pluralism. If the major task of government is to create conditions under which educational institutions will spring up, die, wax, wane, and adapt in response to constantly changing citizen needs, there is little logic in aiding either public or nonpublic schools without regard to whether they keep pace with client aspirations.

As Steeman aptly observes, existing church-related schools as a whole represent far less ideological and pedagogical dissent than formerly. Their patrons, for the most part, have shed many erstwhile ethnic, religious, and social-class-linked distinctives. Most of the schools have made sweeping concessions to the public school modus operandi, partly in an effort (possibly misguided) to qualify for public support. It seems likely, then, that American education, public and nonpublic, is now characterized by less diversity than at virtually any other point in its history.

We have not been assigned the function of making recommendations to the Commission, but in case the Commission should decide to consider some form of aid to nonpublic schools, we think a strong case can be made, on the basis of our work, for using the aid (through a genuine voucher plan, perhaps) to put unprecedented power in the hands of parents--particularly parents of limited means--power to determine by "voting with their feet what schools, new and old, will enjoy enough support to survive. This would be "real" accountability not the "pseudo" accountability of the "payment of results" schemes presently in vogue which historically have proven disastrous in other countries.

Such an approach would give Catholic and other church-related schools a reasonable opportunity to reorient themselves, but would in the long run withhold assistance if they do not. If the Supreme Court will not permit such a framework to be applied to the church-related schools, government should at least foster the development of secular educational options. Perhaps, further, many church-affiliated schools should consider seriously the approaches to de-affiliation discussed by George Elford in our final report.[38]

In summary, if government simply responds to predominating political pressures when it considers aid to nonpublic schools, it may provide assistance of whatever form or magnitude, that simply encourages the current diminishment of educational diversity. We hope, instead, that a way will be found to encourage whatever alternatives citizens consider vital, including options that have not yet had opportunity to emerge. We can only hope that public discontent with public education does not reach the crisis stage be fore legislation is forthcoming.

NOTES

[1]Donald A. Erickson and George F. Madous, Issues of Aid to Nonpublic Schools (final report to the President's Commission on School Finance, produced under USOE Grant No. OEC-0-71-1029; Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Center for Field Research and School Services, Boston College, June 1, 1971), in the following four volumes:

I. Economic and Social Issues of Educational Pluralism
II. (Co-authored by John D. Donovan) Social and Religious Sources of the Crisis in Catholic Schools
III. Public Assistance Programs for Nonpublic Schools
IV. Appendices

(Hereinafter, we refer merely to Our Final Report.)

[2]Thomas Pettigrew, "School Integration in Current Perspective," Urban Review, 3 (January, 1969), 4-8. Silberman has leveled essentially the same charge. Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in Black and White (New York: Random House, 1964), p. 291.

[3]David Seeley quoted, Pettigrew, "School Integration," p. 8.

[4]Our Final Report, Vol. I, pp. V:54-V:78.

[5]Ibid., Vol. I, pp. V:78-V:112.

[6]E.g., Ian Menzies, "Boston Schools at Low Ebb," Boston Globe, March 18, 1971. Also see Robert A. Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1961), pp. 147-150

[7]For documentation on this and following statements, see Our Final Report, Vol. IV, Appendix C.

[8]E.G., James Stuart Davie, "Social Class Factors and School Attendance," Harvard Educational Review, 23 (1953), pp. 175-185.

[9]Colin Greer, Cobweb Attitudes: Essays on Educational and Cultural Mythology (New York: Teachers College Press, 1970); also his "Public Schools: the Myth of the Melting Pot, Saturday Review, November 15, 1969; and his "Immigrants, Negroes and the Public Schools," Urban Review, 3 (Jan., 1969), pp. 9-12.

[10]John E. Coons, William H. Clune III, and Stephen D. Sugarman, Private Wealth and Public Education (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970).

[11]Donald A. Erickson, "Nonpublic Schools in Michigan," in J. Alan Thomas, School Finance and Educational Opportunity in Michigan (Lansing, Mich.: Michigan Department of Education, 1968), pp. 209-291.

[12]Ibid., pp. 224-229.

[13]Ibid., pp. 253-254. The "advantages" were:

1. No students in obsolete classrooms
2. No classrooms with more than 35 pupils
3. No enrollment exceeding building capacity
4. Average textbook age less than 4 years
5. Paperback collection available
6. Closed-circuit television provisions
7. Any kind of educational television
8. Special classes for verbally talented
9. Special classes for quantitatively talented
10. Special classes for artistically talented
11. Full- or part-time librarian
12. Full- or part-time remedial reading teacher
13. More than 10% of teachers in federal summer institutes
14. SMSG mathematics curricula used
15. Nongrading

[14]Greg Hancock, "Public School, Parochial School: A comparative Input-Output Analysis of Governmental and Catholic Elementary Schools in a Large City" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1971), reproduced in Our Final Report, Vol. IV, Appendix E.

[15]Andrew M. Greeley and Peter H. Rossi, The Education of Catholic Americans (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966), pp. 85-91, 95, 223.

[16]Ibid., pp. 199-203, 209-11, 216-17, 221, 227-81, 287-89.

[17]E.g., Donald A. Erickson, Crisis in Illinois Nonpublic Schools (Springfield, Ill.: Elementary and Secondary Nonpublic Schools Study Commission, State of Illinois, 1971), pp. 6-23, 6-24; John D. Donovan and George F. Madous, Catholic Education in the Archdiocese of Boston: Voices of the People (Chestnut Hill, Mass.: New England Catholic Educational Center, 1969), p. 159; Office of Educational Research, University of Notre Dame, Catholic Education in the Archdiocese of St. Louis: Allocation and Distribution of Human and Financial Resources (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame du Lac, 1970), pp. 16-17, 24, 25.

[18]E.g., Jerry Miner, Social and Economic Factors in Spending for Public Education (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1963), p. 24.

[19]Leslie L. Chisholm, School District Reorganization (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1957).

[20]Ibid.

[21]Several relevant studies are well summarized in Douglas H. Heath, "Student Alienation and School," School Review, 78 (August, 1970), 515-528; and in H. Thomas James and Henry M. Levin, "Financing Community Schools, in Henry M. Levin, ed., Community Control of Schools (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1970), pp. 252-54.

[22]Robert A. Nisbet, "Moral Values and Community," International Review of Community Development, 5 (1960), pp. 77-85.

[23]William Van Til, "The Second Coming of the One-Room Schoolhouse," Phi Delta Kappan, 53 (Sept., 1971), pp. 16-17.

[24]David Rogers, 110 Livingston Street (New York: Random House, 1968).

[25]James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).

[26]Donald A. Erickson, "The Plain People vs. the Common Schools," Saturday Review, November 19, 1966, pp. 85-87, 102-03; and his "The 'Plain People' and American Democracy," Commentary, 45 (January, 1968), 36-44; and his "The Persecution of LeRoy Garber," School Review, 78 (Nov., 1969), 81-90.

[27]James B. Conant, "Private and Parochial Schools," Nation's Schools, 49 (June, 1952), 48-50.

[28]Greeley and Rossi, Education of Catholic Americans, pp. 12, 54, 72, 122-25, 132-37, 162-63, 184-85.

[29]Our Final Report, Vol. I, Chaps. III A, IV A

[30]Two studies involving such analyses are: Ernest J. Bartell et al., Catholic Education in the Diocese of St. Louis (Notre Dame, Ind.: Office for Educational Research, University of Notre Dame, 1970); and Commonwealth of Massachusetts Special Commission to Study Public Financial Aid to Nonpublic Primary and Secondary Schools and Certain Related Matters, Nonpublic Education in Massachusetts, Vols. I-III (Boston, the Commission, 1971).

[31]For an expanded treatment of this topic by Theo Steeman; see Our Final Report, Vol. I, Chap. IV A.

[32]Ibid.

[33]Ibid., p. IV-A:31.

[34]Walter H. Beck, Lutheran Elementary Schools in the United States (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1939).

[35]Our Final Report, Vol. I, p. IV:A:48.

[36]Ibid., p. IV:A:50.

[37]Ibid., p. IV:A:53.

[38]Ibid., Vol. I, Chap. X.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF ELEMENTARY AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS ESTIMATED TO SERVE HIGH-AND LOW-INCOME ATTENDANCE AREAS (MICHIGAN, 1966-67)

Estimated Average Head of Household Income	CATHOLIC		CALVINIST		LUTHERAN		PUBLIC	
	Elem. %	Sr.Hi. %	Elem. %	Sr.Hi. %	Elem. %	Sr.Hi. %	Elem. %	Sr.Hi. %
Less than $7,000	54 (263)	46 (78)	35 (12)	20 (1)	33 (30)	0 (0)	57 (1482)	63 (354)
$7,000 or more	46 (222)	54 (91)	65 (22)	80 (4)	67 (61)	100 (1)	43 (1124)	37 (208)
Totals	100 (485)	100 (169)	100 (34)	100 (5)	100 (91)	100 (2)	100 (2606)	100 (562)

TABLE 2

ESTIMATED AVERAGE AGE OF RESIDENCES IN ATTENDANCE AREAS OF ELEMENTARY AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (MICHIGAN, 1966-67)

Estimated Average Age of Residences	CATHOLIC		CALVINIST		LUTHERAN		PUBLIC	
	Elem. %	Sr.Hi. %	Elem. %	Sr.Hi. %	Elem. %	Sr.Hi. %	Elem. %	Sr.Hi. %
Less than 25 yrs. old	50 (246)	47 (73)	79 (26)	100 (5)	71 (65)	100 (2)	58 (1506)	54 (303)
More than 25 yrs. old	50 (248)	53 (83)	21 (7)	0 (0)	29 (26)	0 (0)	42 (1093)	46 (260)
Totals	100 (494)	100 (156)	100 (33)	100 (5)	100 (91)	100 (2)	100 (2599)	100 (563)

TABLE 3

RELATIVE ESTIMATED VALUE OF DOMINANT RESIDENCE IN ATTENDANCE AREAS OF ELEMENTARY AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (MICHIGAN, 1966-67)

Relative Estimated Value	CATHOLIC Elem. %	CATHOLIC Sr.Hi. %	CALVINIST Elem. %	CALVINIST Sr.Hi. %	LUTHERAN Elem. %	LUTHERAN Sr.Hi. %	PUBLIC Elem. %	PUBLIC Sr.Hi. %
Low	34 (166)	30 (46)	18 (6)	20 (1)	17 (15)	0 (0)	43 (1099)	41 (231)
Medium	62 (303)	66 (103)	79 (27)	80 (4)	82 (75)	100 (2)	53 (1363)	56 (314)
High	5 (23)	5 (7)	3 (1)	0 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	4 (112)	3 (16)
Totals	100 (492)	100 (156)	100 (34)	100 (5)	100 (91)	100 (2)	100 (2574)	100 (561)

TABLE 4

ESTIMATED TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD FROM WHICH ELEMENTARY AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS ARE PREDOMINANTLY DRAWN (MICHIGAN, 1966-67)

Neighborhood Type	CATHOLIC Elem. %	CATHOLIC Sr.Hi. %	CALVINIST Elem. %	CALVINIST Sr.Hi. %	LUTHERAN Elem. %	LUTHERAN Sr.Hi. %	PUBLIC Elem. %	PUBLIC Sr.Hi. %
Industrial	15 (49)	19 (22)	5 (1)	33 (1)	9 (5)	0 (0)	9 (163)	13 (29)
Commercial	6 (20)	6 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (2)	0 (0)	4 (69)	1 (3)
Residential	79 (258)	75 (86)	95 (18)	67 (2)	88 (49)	100 (2)	87 (1563)	85 (188)
Totals	100 (327)	100 (115)	100 (19)	100 (3)	100 (56)	100 (2)	100 (1795)	100 (220)

TABLE 5

OCCUPATIONS ESTIMATED AS PREDOMINATING IN ATTENDANCE AREAS OF ELEMENTARY AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (MICHIGAN, 1966-67)

Occupational Classification	CATHOLIC Elem. %	CATHOLIC Sr.Hi. %	CALVINIST Elem. %	CALVINIST Sr.Hi. %	LUTHERAN Elem. %	LUTHERAN Sr.Hi. %	PUBLIC Elem. %	PUBLIC Sr.Hi. %
Low status (semi-skilled workers, farmers, laborers)	76 (348)	65 (98)	55 (18)	40 (2)	86 (72)	100 (2)	79 (1933)	86 (441)
High status (managers, professionals, skilled workers)	24 (107)	35 (52)	45 (15)	60 (3)	14 (12)	0 (0)	21 (500)	14 (74)
Totals	100 (455)	100 (150)	100 (33)	100 (5)	100 (84)	100 (2)	100 (2433)	100 (515)

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1972 O - 457-210